



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,371	09/08/2003	Seung-Kee Yang	5000-1-423	9505
33942	7590	04/13/2005	EXAMINER	
CHA & REITER, LLC				JACKSON JR, JEROME
210 ROUTE 4 EAST STE 103				
PARAMUS, NJ 07652				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2815		

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AC

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/657,371	YANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jerome Jackson Jr.	2815	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 2815

Applicant's election of claims 1-13 in the reply filed on 2/9/05 is acknowledged.

Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: page 7 line 10; page 8 line 8; etc.

Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2,7-10,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Spaeth et al '223.

Spaeth shows in figure 1 a substrate 6, a semiconductor layer 7 and a depletion region between 6 and 7 defining a photo-absorption layer; and , first and second "grooves" for refraction and reflection of light signals. As applicant defines "groove" as a reflecting surface claim 1 does not distinguish over Spaeth. The functional language in the claim "so that ... is minimized" does not structurally distinguish the claim over Spaeth which functions in the same manner. Claim 2 is rejected regardless of the process used to produce the final product because Spaeth shows an "inclined profile" substrae. Also, patentability of a product by process claim is determined by the final product, regardless of how actually made, In re Hirao 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also In re Brown 173 USPQ 685; In re Luck 177 USPQ 523; In re Fessman 180 USPQ 324; In re Avery 186 USPQ 161; In re Wertheim 191 USPQ 90; and In re Morosi 218 USPQ 289, all of which make it clear that it is patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above caselaw makes clear.

Claim 7 is rejected as Spaeth teaches antireflection coating on the reflection surfaces 4 (col.3 lines 65-68). In re claim 8 see the above recited product-by-process caselaw. Claim 9 is rejected as Spaeth also teaches a silvering layer in column 3. Claim 10 is rejected as the silver layer would obviously be greater thickness than a skin depth

to function properly as a reflector. Claim 13 is rejected as Spaeth shows contacts 8 and 9.

Claims 1-10,12,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spaeth in view of Kato '097.

In regard to claims 2-6 Kato shows an etched recess in a flat substrate to enable structural stability and low cost for a reflective type photodetector (col.12 lines 48-63). It would have been obvious to have practiced a similar recess structure in a Spaeth type device to improve structural stability and reduce manufacturing costs. The etching solution described in column 8 of Kato appears to enable the (111) plane, 50-60 degree angle, to be exposed. In any event the (111) plane and 50-60 degree angle would be obvious to practice for the Kato type device because the photodetecting section is orthogonal to the incident light. Claim 12 is rejected as Kato suggests a substrate which is non-absorbing to improve cut-off frequency (col.10 lines 11-20). It likewise would have been obvious to have designed a Spaeth type device with a similar non-absorbing substrate to reduce cut-off frequency degradation.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spaeth and Kato as applied above and further in view of Furuya '505.

In re claim 11 Furuya shows in figure 4 a similar reflecting structure and suggests a silicon nitride layer below the reflecting metal layers to improve adhesion or reflection or improve device design. Claim 11 is obvious structure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerome Jackson Jr. whose telephone number is 571 272 1730. The examiner can normally be reached on t-th 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on 571 272 1664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jj

JEROME JACKSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER